

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/779,964	02/09/2001	Chris R. Fultz	2102937-900110	8207
7590 01/06/2005			EXAMINER	
Christopher Fultz Chrisco Software Development, Inc. Loma Linda, CA 92350			VIG, NARESH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3629	
		DATE MAILED: 01/06/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<i>(1)</i>				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/779,964	FULTZ, CHRIS R.				
│ 	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Naresh Vig	3629				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory provided to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may on. a reply within the statutory minimum of the critical apply and will expire SIX (6) MO statute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6	09 February 2001.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑	This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice und	ler <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the apple 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction as	ndrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐	accepted or b) objected to	b by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co						
	o Examinor. Note the attach	ed office Action of John 1 10-132.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for form a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu	nents have been received. nents have been received in priority documents have bee reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No In received in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	inst of the certified copies no	ot received.				
Attachment(s)	,, –					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	4) ∐ Interview Paper No	r Summary (PTO-413) b(s)/Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/779,964

Art Unit: 3629

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 2 objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 1 and 2 recites the limitation:

"inputting into the computer system of the mover entity".

"transmitting the customer identity, needs and appointment information file to the field sales representitive".

"transmitting the estimate"

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 1 and 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete. Claims 1 and 2 recite the limitation "transmitting the customer identity, needs and appointment information file to the field sales representative". Field sales representative is a person, and the file is transmitted to the computer system of the field sales representative.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Storch et al. US Patent 5,920,846 hereinafter known as Storch in view of an article "Portable Computing Extends The Enterprise" by Deb Navas.

Regarding claims 1 and 2, Storch teaches system and method for an automated sales method (processing service request). Storch does not teach system and method for moving and storing industry (field of use). However, Official notice it taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that it is a business choice to decide how to use design the system and method to meet business requirements.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Storch for moving and storing industry to automate the business objective (In re Venner, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958).

Storch teaches:

Application/Control Number: 09/779,964

Art Unit: 3629

inputting into the computer system of the mover entity (field of use) the customer identity and needs (The order taker person 61 or customer inputs customer information into the computer order entry system 63 such as the customer's name and phone number (if applicable), address, and the type of service requested) [col. 16, line 66].

entering into the computer system of the mover entity an appointment date for the customer and the field sales representative of the mover entity (The system has computer data processing means for assigning to the service order an available appointment date and time for installation of the requested service based upon updated information indicating the availability of qualified outside technicians).

transmitting the customer identity, needs and appointment information file to the field sales representative (WFA/DO transmits a copy of the service order to technician).

Storch does not teach entering into the customer file at the customer location the details of the material to be moved. However, Navas teaches remote terminals can now access and interact with host applications, intranets, and the Internet in real time, via radio or cellular communications, effectively making the corporate information system and other data resources accessible from any location in the world.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Storch as taught by Navas to create a mobile and productive support team.

Storch does not teach processing the details of the material to be moved (e.g. gathering information to determine work load) to produce an estimate of the details for moving the material and an order for moving the material (generate an estimate).

Application/Control Number: 09/779,964

Art Unit: 3629

However, Navas teaches companies across all industries as well as government agencies have invested billions in implementing market-specific applications, such as dispatch and field service management.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Storch as taught by Navas to create a mobile and productive support team.

Storch in view or Navas teaches capability of transmitting the estimate and order to the computer of the mover entity (e.g. host computer) for further processing.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 CRF '1.111 (c) to consider the references fully when responding to this office action.

1. Borghesi et al. US Patent 5,950,169

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Naresh Vig whose telephone number is 703.305.3372. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 5:00 (Alt Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 703.308.2702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/779,964 Page 6

Art Unit: 3629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Naresh Vig Patent Examiner December 3, 2004

Harry